

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
COLUMBIA DIVISION**

**SHARN GREEN aka SHAWN GREEN,)
vs.)
Plaintiff,)
vs.)
CORRECTIONS CORPORATION OF)
AMERICA, et al.,)
Defendants.)**

**CASE NO. 1:10-00068
JUDGE TRAUGER/KNOWLES**

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

This matter is before the Court upon a three-page document filed by the pro se Plaintiff headed “Motion in Opposition to Defendants Motion for Summary Judgement [sic] and Plaintiff Motion for Summary Judgement [sic].” Docket No. 75. Despite the latter portion of the heading, the document appears to be simply a Response to a Motion for Summary Judgment previously filed by Defendants Corrections Corporation of America/South Central Correctional Facility, Cherry Lindamood, Leigh Kilzer, Mark Hacker, Sabrina Tomlinson, and Kristen Buttram.¹ Docket No. 61.

To the extent that the instant document can be construed as a Motion seeking summary judgment for Plaintiff, that Motion should be DENIED, for three reasons: (1) Plaintiff did not

¹ The Court has previously considered the instant document as a Response to those Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment and has previously recommended that those Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment be granted. Docket No. 92. Judge Trauger adopted and approved that Report and Recommendation, and granted those Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment. Docket No. 99.

file a supporting Memorandum of Law as required by Local Rule 7.01(a); (2) Plaintiff did not file a Statement of Undisputed Material Facts as required by Local Rule 56.01(b); and (3) Plaintiff does not establish in the instant document that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that he is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law.

Under Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, any party has fourteen (14) days after service of this Report and Recommendation in which to file any written objections to this Recommendation with the District Court. Any party opposing said objections shall have fourteen (14) days after service of any objections filed to this Report in which to file any response to said objections. Failure to file specific objections within fourteen (14) days of service of this Report and Recommendation can constitute a waiver of further appeal of this Recommendation. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 106 S.Ct. 466, 88 L. Ed. 2d 435 (1985), *reh'g denied*, 474 U.S. 1111 (1986); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72.



E. Clifton Knowles
E. Clifton Knowles
United States Magistrate Judge